UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,618	11/14/2003	Stephen R. Quatrano	CIS03-60(8590)	2512

7590 03/08/2005	EXAMINER
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C. Westborough Office Park 1700 West Park Drive Westborough, MA 01581	NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/713,618	QUATRANO ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Saleh Najjar	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 February 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>21-46</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>21-31,33-42 and 44-46</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>32 and 43</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04 February 2004</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

1.   This action is responsive to the preliminary amendment filed on February 4,

2004. Claims 1-20 were canceled. Claims 21-46 were newly added. Claims 21-46 are

pending. Claims 21-46 represent a method and system for a copy server for

collaboration and electronic commerce.

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that
form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by
another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for
patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the
requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the
invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3.   Claims 21-22, 26-27, 33, 37-38, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being anticipated by Anupam et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,687,739.

Anupam teaches the invention as claimed including a technique for obtaining and

exchanging information on the World Wide Web (see abstract).

As to claim 21, Anupam teaches a method for providing collaboration between a

first user and a second user comprising:

receiving, at a web site, a request from the first user with a browser (see figs. 1-

3; col. 7, lines 1-60, Anupam discloses that a user submits a request using a browser);

processing the request with information related to the first user to create a

page with dynamic content (see col. 9, lines 15-25, Anupam discloses that a web page

with dynamic content is created in response to user request);

copying the page with dynamic content into a copy server without

changing any locators in the page, the copy server having the page with dynamic

content as a copied page (see co. 9, lines 1-60, Anupam discloses that the requested

web page is copied to the gateway cache);

providing, to the first user, a locator for the copied page of the copy server,

the locator allowing the first user to access the copied page from the copy server;

and providing, to the second user, the locator for the copied page of the copy

server, the locator allowing the second user to access the copied page from the

copy server, the first user and the second user viewing versions of the same copied page (see col. 7, lines 1-65, Anupam discloses that a reference for the copied page is relayed to the second user); and

synchronizing access to the copied page to:

i) prevent race conditions between the first and second user for access to the copied page; and ii) to avoid redundant operations made by at least one of the first user and the second user to the copied page (see col. 6, lines 10-20; col. 9, lines 25-65, Anupam discloses that certain access control is performed in which different capabilities are afforded to different collaborators and that the leader has control over the session).

Claim 22 is similar to claim 21 and adds the limitation of synchronizing access to the copied page to block multiple users from operating on the copied page (see col. 6, lines 10-20; col. 9, lines 25-65, Anupam discloses that certain access control is performed in which different capabilities are afforded to different collaborators and that the leader has control over the session).

As to claim 26, Anupam teaches the method of claim 22 further comprising copying the copied page to each of the first and second users, the copied page residing on a respective user browser, wherein each of the first and second users access the copied page on the respected user browser, and wherein the copy server allows one of the first and second users to be operating on the copied page at the copy server (see col. 8, lines 1-60, Anupam discloses that the gateway functionality can be included at the client computer).

As to claim 27, Anupam teaches the method of claim 26 wherein the second user corresponds to an agent browser responsive to the first user browser (see col. 9, lines 55-65).

Claims 33, 37-38, and 44-46 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 21-22, 26-27 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 23-25, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Anupam further in view of Kley et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,862,346.

Anupam teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a technique for

obtaining and exchanging information on the World Wide Web (see abstract).

As to claim 23, Anupam teaches the method of claim 22 wherein the locator is

employed by the first user for modifying the copied page (see col. 9, lines 55-65).

Anupam fails to teach the limitation wherein the second user is blocked from

modifying the copied page until the modifications performed by the first user are

written to the copied page at the copy server.

However, Kley teaches a Distributed group activity data network system and

method where synchronized access to shared files is controlled by group activity files at

the server (see abstract). Kley teaches that the second user is blocked from modifying

the copied page until the modifications performed by the first user are

written to the copied page at the copy server (see col. 8, lines 1-40, Kley discloses that

a second user is blocked from making changes to a file currently being modified by a

first user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Anupam in view of Kley so that a second user is blocked from

modifying a file being modified by a first user. One would be motivated to do so since

Anupam suggests that access control to a shared document is desired.

As to claim 24, Anupam teaches the method of claim 22.

Anupam fails to tc explicitly teach identifying a collaboration set of users having

the ability to access the copied page, the first and second users included in the

collaboration set; and permitting only one of the first and second users from operating on the copied page.

However, Kley teaches a Distributed group activity data network system and method where synchronized access to shared files is controlled by group activity files at the server (see abstract). Kley teaches identifying a collaboration set of users having the ability to access the copied page, the first and second users included in the collaboration set; and permitting only one of the first and second users from operating on the copied page (see col. 7, lines 1-60; col. 8, lines 1-40, Kley discloses that a set of authorized user group is identified and that a second user is blocked from making changes to a file currently being modified by a first user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Anupam in view of Kley so that an auhorized user set is identified and a second user is blocked from modifying a file being modified by a first user. One would be motivated to do so since Anupam suggests that access control to a shared document is desired.

As to claim 25, Anupam teaches the method of claim 24 further comprising establishing a collaboration session by sending cookies between the copy server and the first and second user browsers, the copy server responsive to a collaboration server for sending cookies and identifying modifications to the collaboration set (see col. 9, lines 1-60).

Claims 34-36 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 23-25 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

6.   Claims 29-31, and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anupam further in view of Scherpbier, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,365 (referred to hereafter as Scherp).

Anupam teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a technique for obtaining and exchanging information on the World Wide Web (see abstract).

As to clam 29, Anupam teaches the method of claim 22 further comprising:

determine which information of the copy page each of the first and second
user is permitted to observer (see col. 6, lines 1-40, Anupam discloses that a user can
be designated as a leader);

Anupam fails to teach the claimed limitation of filtering the content of the page
displayed on the respective user browser of the first and second user.

However, Scherp teaches a browser controller in a shared browser environment
having a pilot and passenger browser collaboration (see abstract). Scherp teaches
filtering the content of the page displayed on the respective user browser of the first and
second user (see col. 5, lines 55-67; col. 6, lines 1-10, Anupam discloses that the web
page shared by a first and second passenger users is filtered).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to modify Anupam in view of Scherp so that a shared web page is filtered.
One would be motivated to do so to provide users different browser viewing capabilities
as suggested by Anupam (see col. 6).

As to claims 30-31, Anupam teaches the method of claim 29.

Anupam fails to teach the claimed limitation of discriminating between the
filtered versions of the copied pages by identifying the corresponding request for the
copied page emanating from each of the first and second user.

However, Scherp teaches a browser controller in a shared browser environment
having a pilot and passenger browser collaboration (see abstract). Scherp teaches
discriminating between the filtered versions of the copied pages by identifying the
corresponding request for the copied page emanating from each of the first and second
user (see col. 5, lines 55-67; col. 6, lines 1-60, Anupam discloses that the web page
shared by a passenger and pilot is filtered to allow the passenger and pilot to see
different versions of a web page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to modify Anupam in view of Scherp to discriminate between the filtered
versions of the copied pages by identifying the corresponding request for the copied
page emanating from each of the first and second user. One would be motivated to do

so to provide different users different browser viewing capabilities as suggested by Anupam (see col. 6).

As to claim 31, Anupam teaches the method of claim 29.

Anupam fails to explicitly teach the limitations of identifying the information to be limited in the copied page; suppressing the identified information from the information sent to the browser of the second user by selectively sending according to the filter, and; receiving a form including information corresponding to the suppressed information from the first user.

However, Scherp teaches a browser controller in a shared browser environment having a pilot and passenger browser collaboration (see abstract). Scherp teaches identifying the information to be limited in the copied page; suppressing the identified information from the information sent to the browser of the second user by selectively sending according to the filter, and; receiving a form including information corresponding to the suppressed information from the first user (see col. 5, lines 1-65; col. 6, lines 1-60, Anupam discloses that the web page shared by a passenger and pilot is filtered to allow the passenger and pilot to see different versions of a web page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Anupam in view of Scherp by identifying the information to be limited in the copied page; suppressing the identified information from the information sent to the browser of the second user by selectively sending according to the filter, and; receiving a form including information corresponding to the suppressed information from the first use. One would be motivated to do so to provide different users different browser viewing capabilities as suggested by Anupam (see col. 6).

Claims 40-42 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 29-31 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

7.   Claims 28, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anupam further in view of Kley and further in view of Sastry et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,687,877.

Anupam teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a technique for obtaining and exchanging information on the World Wide Web (see abstract).

As to claim 28, Anupam teaches the method of claim 22.

Anupam fails to teach the limitation of unblocking the second user when the first user completes operating on the copied page at the copy server.
However, Kley teaches a Distributed group activity data network system and method where synchronized access to shared files is controlled by group activity files at the server (see abstract). Kley teaches unblocking the second user when the first user completes operating on the copied page at the copy server (see col. 8, lines 1-40, Kley discloses that a second user is blocked from making changes to a file currently being modified by a first user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Anupam in view of Kley so that a second user is un-blocked from modifying a file after completion by a first user. One would be motivated to do so since Anupam suggests that access control to a shared document is desired.

The combination of Anupam and Kely do not teach the limitations of providing an informational message to the second user when the first user is operating on the copied page at the copy server.

However, Sastry teaches a WEB-based call center where the customer and agent terminals navigate through shared information (see abstract). Sastry teaches providing an informational message to the second user when the first user is operating on the copied page at the copy server (see col. 2, lines 55-65, Sastry discloses that a message is sent o the user indicating that the file annotations were made to a shared file).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Anupam and Kley so that an informational message is provided to the second user when the first user is operating on the copied page at the copy server. One would be motivated to do so since Anupam suggests that access control to a shared document is desired.

Claim 39 does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 28 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

8.   Claims 32 and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Thee prior art of record fails to teach neither singly nor in combination the claimed limitation wherein operating on the copied page further comprises identifying which of the first and second user is modifying the copied page or

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (571)272-4006. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157